

PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource

From: Chowdhury, Prosanta
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2012 1:30 PM
To: 'PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com'
Cc: PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource; 'James.Mallon@pseg.com'; 'David.Robillard@pseg.com'; Segala, John; Silvia, Andrea; Clark, Phyllis; Canova, Michael; McLellan, Judith; Tammara, Seshagiri; Schaaf, Robert; McCoppin, Michael
Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 50 (eRAI 6283) SRP-02.02.01-02.02.02 (RPAC-RSAC)
Attachments: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 50 (eRAI 6283).pdf

Please find attached RAI 50 for the PSEG Site ESP Application. A draft of the RAI was provided to you on February 1, 2012. You informed via email on February 10, 2012, that you would not need a clarification call involving this specific RAI, and therefore, we are issuing this RAI as final with no changes made to it.

The schedule we have established for review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 calendar days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be responded to within 30 calendar days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30-calendar day period so that the staff can assess how this information will impact the published schedule.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Prosanta Chowdhury
Project Manager
Licensing Branch 1 (LB1)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors
301-415-1647

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_RAI
Email Number: 109

Mail Envelope Properties (320204600EA7B9408FE833FF15E4FF7D7F5D91E913)

Subject: PSEG Site ESPA FINAL RAI 50 (eRAI 6283) SRP-02.02.01-02.02.02
(RPAC-RSAC)
Sent Date: 2/10/2012 1:30:03 PM
Received Date: 2/10/2012 1:30:04 PM
From: Chowdhury, Prosanta

Created By: Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"PSEGESPeRAIPEm Resource" <PSEGESPeRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"James.Mallon@pseg.com" <'James.Mallon@pseg.com'>

Tracking Status: None

"David.Robillard@pseg.com" <'David.Robillard@pseg.com'>

Tracking Status: None

"Segala, John" <John.Segala@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Silvia, Andrea" <Andrea.Silvia@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Clark, Phyllis" <Phyllis.Clark@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Canova, Michael" <Michael.Canova@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McLellan, Judith" <Judith.McLellan@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Tammara, Seshagiri" <Seshagiri.Tammara@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"McCoppin, Michael" <Michael.McCoppin@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

| Files | Size | Date & Time |
|---|------|----------------------|
| MESSAGE | 969 | 2/10/2012 1:30:04 PM |
| PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI 50 (eRAI 6283).pdf | | 38551 |

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information No. 50

Application Revision 0

FINAL

2/10/2012

PSEG Site ESP

PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC

Docket No. 52-043

SRP Section: 02.02.01-02.02.02 - Identification of Potential Hazards in Site Vicinity

Application Section: 2.2.1-2.2.2

QUESTIONS for Siting and Accident Conseq Branch (RSAC)

02.02.01-02.02.02-1

RS-002 and RG 1.206 provide guidance regarding the information that is needed to ensure potential hazards in the site vicinity are identified and evaluated in order to meet the siting criteria in 10 CFR 100.20 and 10 CFR 100.21.

In order to address and evaluate the potential hazards in the site vicinity, the applicant identified nearby industrial, transportation and military facilities in SSAR Section 2.2.1 and presented the descriptions of these identified facilities in SSAR Section 2.2.2. The staff's review identified the information pertaining to the following facilities is either not presented or not presented in a consistent manner between the text and figure 2.2-1, and therefore need the clarification and update of the information, that may be used further in the evaluation of potential hazards in SSAR Section 2.2.3.

1. The applicant states the Valero Delaware City Refinery ceased operations in 2009. Are the hazardous material inventories shipped to and from this facility via the Delaware River included in the evaluation in SSAR Section 2.2.3? If they are not, then will they be evaluated in the future if and when it becomes operational over the operational life of the proposed plant? Please clarify.
2. The transportation routes (Delaware Route 7 and Delaware Route 896) listed between 5 and 10 miles in SSAR Section 2.2.1 are not shown on Figure 2.2-1, and the routes (DE9, DE25, and DE425) which are shown on Figure 2.2-1 are not listed in the text. Please resolve the inconsistencies.
3. The applicant did not list railroads and also did not address the railroad that passes within 10 miles SW through NW of the site, and the spur connection to the Valero Delaware City Refinery. Please include the information, address and evaluate as appropriate.
4. Although a gas transmission pipeline is noted as being 5.9 miles away from the proposed PSEG site in SSAR Section 2.2.2.2, it is not listed among the facilities evaluated in Section 2.2.3. In addition, the staff finds a hazardous liquid pipeline located about 9 miles to the north-northwest near the Air Liquide and Formosa plants. Please clarify, update and evaluate as appropriate.

5. At least two “General Anchorage Areas” are shown in SSAR Figure 2.2-3 as being within 5 miles of the site, the closest being 0.75 mile away. These facilities are not addressed in the application. Furthermore, Figure 2.2-3 is of very poor quality and these facilities are barely legible. The applicant should address these facilities and evaluate as appropriate by including an updated or additional, better quality figure.